

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,299	06/26/2001	Steven J. Simske	10013313-1	2347

7590 10/05/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/892,299	Applicant(s) SIMSKE, STEVEN J.	
	Examiner Houshang Safaipoor	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 17-19, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-16, 20 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/17/03 & 7/26/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 17-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,296,939).

Regarding claim 1, Suzuki discloses a method, comprising: preview scanning a document and generating a preview scan image; determining a document type based on the preview scan image; mapping the document type to a predetermined workflow; scanning the document to capture an image of the document; and executing the workflow (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Regarding claim 2, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein determining a document type comprises: generating a region signature of a predetermined portion of the preview scan image; comparing the region signature with known region signatures; determining a match with a known region signature; and determining the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Regarding claim 3, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein determining a document type comprises: generating a region signature of a predetermined portion of the preview scan image, the region signature including size and location of the

predetermined portion, relative and absolute distribution, and percentage of text and image; comparing the region signature with stored region signatures; determining a match with at least one stored region signature; and determining the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 8, lines 3-29).

Regarding claim 4, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein determining a document type comprises: generating a region signature of the preview scan image; comparing the region signature with learned region signatures of previous scan tasks; determining a match with a learned region signature; and determining the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Regarding claim 5, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein determining a document type comprises: generating a region signature of the preview scan image; comparing the region signature with stored template region signatures of certain common document types; determining a match with a stored template region signature; and determining the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 8, lines 3-29).

Regarding claim 6, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein executing the workflow comprises: determining at least one post-scan application for manipulating the scanned image; automatically launching the at least one post-scan application; and processing the scanned image (col. 8, lines 3-29).

Regarding claim 7, Suzuki discloses the method, as set forth in claim 1, wherein executing the workflow comprises: determining at least one post-scan application for manipulating the scanned image; displaying the selection of the at least one post-scan application

to solicit user input; automatically launching the at least one post-scan application; and processing the scanned image.

Regarding claim 17, Suzuki discloses a system, comprising: a digital image capture device operable to capture images; a scanning module operable to preview scan a document and generate a preview scan image; and an automated scan workflow module operable to determine a document type based on the preview scan image, map the document type to a predetermined workflow, and executing the workflow (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Regarding claim 18, Suzuki discloses the system, as set forth in claim 17, wherein the digital image capture device is a device selected from the group consisting of a scanner, a copier, a camera, a facsimile device, a digital sender, a multipurpose device, and a multifunction device (col. 5, lines 43-47).

Regarding claim 19, Suzuki discloses the system, as set forth in claim 17, wherein the automated scan workflow module is operable to generate a region signature of a predetermined portion of the preview scan image, compare the region signature with known region signatures, determine a match with a known region signature, and determine the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 8, lines 3-29).

Regarding claim 21, Suzuki discloses a scanner comprising: a scanning module operable to preview scan a document and generate a preview scan image; and an automated scan workflow module operable to determine a document type based on the preview scan image, map the document type to a predetermined workflow, and executing the workflow (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Regarding claim 22, Suzuki discloses the scanner, as set forth in claim 21, wherein the automated scan workflow module is operable to generate a region signature of a predetermined portion of the preview scan image, compare the region signature with known region signatures, determine a match with a known region signature, and determine the predetermined workflow in response to the matched region signature (col. 7, lines 29-49).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-16, 20 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (703)306-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles, Sr. can be reached on (703)305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Houshang Safaipoor
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622
September 30, 2004


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600